



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

or the Wars of Turlogh. By the decision of modern word-forgers I do not offer to abide. In the mis-spelling of recent and obscure scribes, falling into error through their ignorance or their pedantry, I do not recognise materials available for the construction of a standard of orthography, or the establishment of principles of criticism.

ON THE AGE OF OGHAM WRITING.

No. IV.

BY JOHN WINDELE, ESQ.

[*Read at the Meeting of November 5th.*]

At the hazard of wearying the endurance of the Society by thus prolonging the discussion of what, I fear, many will regard as an opiate subject, I am compelled to offer a few more "last words" in reference to this question, and Dr. Graves' rejoinder read at your late meeting.

In doing so, I may as well observe, parenthetically, that the engraving of the Burnfort and Gleann-na-g-cloch inscriptions given in the *Transactions* for 1850, page 142, and stated to have been supplied by the Royal Irish Academy, is very far from being accurate, is calculated to mislead, and does not correspond with the drawing furnished by me when forwarding my original communication on the subject.

And now as to Dr. Graves' paper; in this he claims the merit of having narrowed the question in dispute to a single point, and I am free to admit that he has to some extent done so; but it is by omitting the part of Hamlet, and avoiding all reference to his notable "Sagittar," whom he would willingly leave to an undisturbed sleep, in the unconsecrated crypt at Burnfort. By this manœuvre he changes his position, turns away the tide of warfare from himself, and adroitly places me on the defensive—a feat very dexterous indeed, and displaying his "cunning of fence" to some purpose. And yet I hardly regret the ruse; for although I have really no more concern with Mr. Horgan's translation than with any of the several others heretofore mentioned by me, yet I by no means object to stand up in vindication of the scholarship of my deceased friend, or to show that he was not without *some* show of reason for the translation he had given; that it was consonant with the language and perfectly natural and unforced, whilst no sufficient reasons had been offered to invalidate it.

The controversy regarding the antagonist translation, that of "Sagittar," being virtually at an end by its being quietly withdrawn from the field, this in reference to "*Sagi Dari*" may now be reduced within less extensive limits, in as much as Dr. Graves has abandoned his objections to the convertibility of the double *t* to *d*—reluctantly to be sure, as was natural, for he says in so doing, "I was quite aware

that in Irish MSS., *especially the more modern ones*, *tt* is frequently put for *d*." But I cannot let him off with this reservation of "more modern ones," by which he would imply that the double *t* was after all merely modern. Dr. O'Donovan, in his grammar, says it is *ancient*, and Dr. O'Brien and O'Reilly assert the same in their dictionaries, and all had ample evidence in their favour; I adduced their authority in a former paper to this effect, and, were it necessary, I could now produce several old examples from my own reading.

As regards the much vexed "*Sagi*," Dr. Graves has a little shifted his position. The form in which it appears in O'Reilly (*Sacc*) is just as abhorrent to his sight as that in which Mr. Horgan found it in the inscription, for he writes: "I am so bold as to say that no such word exists in the Irish language," and to sustain this, not ill-designated *bold* assertion, he denounces the word as "a figment, a forgery, contrived by modern dabblers in etymology;" strong expressions truly, and a summary and decisive mode of disposing of an inconvenient obstacle in his way. We have him therefore following this up by unequivocally charging O'Reilly with borrowing it from Vallancey.

Now I have searched through Vallancey's works for the alleged parentage of this "figment," and have been unable to find a single instance to justify the denunciation. In the *Collectanea*, vol. iii. p. 533, as referred to by Dr. Graves, the words *Sagah* and *Sag* occur. In vol. iv. p. 449, we have *Sagan* and *Segan*; in vol. v. p. 12, "*Sag-air*, signifying the divine *Saga*," and in vol. vi. p. 161, *Seach-nab*, or *Sach-nab*, the name, as he incorrectly says, on the authority of Cormac's Glossary, of an order of *Pagan* priesthood first, and afterwards of a Christian ecclesiastical office, next in rank to the abbot. It may hence be fairly presumed, that if O'Reilly had adopted this "forged" word into his dictionary from Vallancey, he would have given it in some one of those forms in which that "dabbler in etymology" had written it, and not in that in which he (O'R.) has printed it. Not having done so, Dr. Graves' hazardous assertion is therefore stamped with wrong and injustice to the memory of a scholar, who has deserved better from the cultivators of Irish literature.

The evidence of archbishop Cormac, in favour of the word *Sec-nab*, I would recommend to Dr. Graves' special consideration. In it we evidently find this *Sacc*, so repugnant to his theory. The term also occurs in the *Annals of Innisfallen* at A.D. 906, and in the *Four Masters* at 950, and again at 1089, where the latter translate it *proir* or prior. But Cormac explains it by "secund ab, id est secundus abbas, vel secundus abbati, vel secundus abbatem."

This singularly corresponds with the Hebrew *Sagan*, rendered in the Vulgate, "sacerdotum secundum" (*Jeremias*, lii. 24). I omit what Vallancey repeats from Buxtorf, &c., but cannot avoid extracting a rather suggestive sentence, although even given by him: "In the Nomenclatura Egypto Arabica, of Kercher," he says, "we find *Sach scriba*; *Sachnabad*, hierophantes."—vol. vi. p. 161. Were these terms

and words borrowed alike by Jews and Egyptians from the Roman missionaries, as the Irish borrowed their *Saccart*?

Why then should either O'Reilly or Vallancey be charged with the forgery of *Sag* or *Sacc*, when we have it evidently entering into the composition of such terms as *Sec-nap*, or *Sec-nab*, and such names as *Segan* and *Saghene*, and probably *Sechnan* (that of one of St. Patrick's three physicians), and *Seachnall*, and *Seachnasack*?

I am not aware that the term *Sec*, or *Seacnab*, has as yet been impressed into the sacred cohort with *Easbog*, *Sagart*, *Deochain*, and *Aistreoir*. If not, perhaps it might be convenient to do so forthwith. In this word, which cannot be impeached as a forgery of Vallancey's, and which so strikingly claims an oriental kindred, we may, I think, place every reliance. It evidently contains the root of Mr. Horgan's *Sagi*, and I venture to present it as the justification of my reverend friend, as well as of the "dabbler in etymology" and his alleged copyist, O'Reilly. With all his literary sinfulness Vallancey had, after all, great opportunities, extensive reading, and active intercourse with the best Irish scholars of his time, as C. O'Connor, Dr. O'Brien, O'Halloran, Peter Connell, &c., and when we find him sustained by "competent" Irish scholars of our own day, even by men whom Dr. Graves, in the supremacy of his own acquirements in Irish, has the temerity to sneer at, we may be safe in placing some degree of faith, for once at least, in the genuineness of the word which he has given in the forms of *Sag*, *Sach*, *Segan*, &c.*

Upon these evidences in support of O'Reilly's truthfulness, we may, I think, rest the question at present. Dr. Graves no doubt may not be content with them, for nothing short of examples gathered from the writings of the Mac Egans, Mac Fibrises, O'Clerys, and ancient MSS., such as the *Liber Hymnorum*, &c., works really inaccessible to me, will, it seems, satisfy him; and yet I am persuaded that, when our old literature shall have been sufficiently examined, and when the present short comings of our lexicons shall be remedied, by the labours and researches of our O'Donovans, Currys, Connellans, &c., additional light will be thrown on the genuineness of this word. I am equally satisfied, that when our Ogham inscriptions shall be all collected together, and truly understood, that many words long since become obsolete, will be re-discovered, and that it will form no valid ground of objection to them that they cannot now be found in our Irish lexicons.

Notwithstanding Dr. Graves' warning, I am still disposed to regard *Sai*, *Sui*, or *Saoi* as synonymous and identical with *Sagi*; and although, by a process of assertion familiar to him, he says that the word was *always* spelt as *Sai* or *Sui*, I beg to assert that I have also

* I have seen with Mr. John O'Daly, of Dublin, an old Irish MS. Vocabulary evidently much older than the time of Vallancey, in which is given the following, which I offer, to show that other "dabblers" have fallen into the like errors:—

"*Sagad*, to adore, hence *Sagart*, a priest."

"*Sagart*, from *Sag*, to adore, and *Art*, God."

seen it spelt as *Saoi*, *Saidh*, and *Saoigh*, thus demonstrating that it takes the *g*. If in the way of "cacography," be it so. In the old times of unsettled and uncertain orthography—for such times there were—the commutation and dropping or addition of *letters* was frequent, and words occasionally took strange forms, as well as pronunciations, different from their apparent orthography. I know that at the present day the Irish name of the City of Cork, which is generally spelt *Corcach* and *Corcaidh*, is pronounced invariably *Corcaig*.

Whether "the notion of holiness ever entered into the signification of the word *Sai*," is what I presume can hardly be a question. Somehow we find it always used in our old annals and writings in reference to religious men—clerics, and it would be difficult now to divest it of that association.

Although Dr. Graves deserves great credit for his shrewd discovery of the misprint of *Sadi*, yet as some "dogs will bay the brightest moon," I incline to think that it was hardly worth his inditing a paragraph upon it.

Having as I think shown that *Sag* (and therefore *Sagi*) is a genuine Irish word and not a figment, I now submit that the Rev. Mr. Horgan was borne out in regarding *Sagart* as a native term, and not one derived from the Latin. I freely avow myself to be one of that denounced class who believe that there was a large portion of the Irish and Latin languages of a common kindred origin, and not the one derived from the other. I am a subscriber with Pezron, Dr. O'Brien, Lepsius, Sir William Gell and Sir William Betham, to the Celtic origin of the Umbri, Etrurians, and partly of the Roman population, founded upon evidences which Dr. Graves cannot controvert, and as I also believe that the heathen Irish had a religion, I am of opinion, absurd as it may seem, and even though it may really be "a waste of time to argue" with me upon it, that they possessed terms in their language, before the advent of Christian missionaries, to designate the places wherein they worshipped, the persons who ministered in that worship, the deities whom they adored, and the rites and supplications which they applied to the objects of their erring belief, and that they have left us memorials and monuments of that religion to this day. To be sure, gentlemen of the school of which the charlatan Innes seems to have been the great oracle, and Ledwich the high priest, will hardly admit any such thing. It would be hard to expect it from Innes, who laid it down that the ancient Irish possessed no knowledge of numbers until they came to an acquaintance with the Latin tongue, or from Dr. Wood, who tells us that they had no words distinct from those which appear to be derivations from the Latin language to express the natural relations of kindred (*Inquiry into the Primitive Inhabitants of Ireland*, pp. 73—74). But whilst I admit with Dr. O'Brien that the Irish borrowed from the Latin "such words as are significative of the rites and mysteries of the Christian religion, objects which no people could have words for before the preaching of the Gospel," I am not disposed to resign words which must be primitive in the Irish, and

which no language could be without, as *dia, sol, luan, spirid, anm, beatha, saccair, sagart, ceall, cala, pobul, tearmon, adhair, orat, cora, corp, loc, tir, tech, fear, niall, nead, mil, cart, &c.*, and accept them as derivatives from the Latin *deus, sol, luna, spiritus, anima, vita, sacer, sacerdos, cella, cala, populus, terminus, adoro, oratio, chorus, corpus, locus, terra, tectum, vir, nobilis, nidus, mel, carta, &c.* Were I to admit a process of this kind, the Gælic language would incontinently be divested of a very large portion of its vocabulary. Indeed, I would venture to say, that the most desperate “dabbler in etymology” would scarcely hazard the attempt. A dispassionate inquirer can hardly fail to recognise a community of origin between a large number of Latin and Irish words totally independent of religious teaching. Those who, like Dr. Graves, would seek to derive the words of the one from the other, are easily attracted and misled by the deceptive nature of etymological speculations. To this tendency we owe his direct derivation, in the “Sir Absolute” style, of the “three Irish substantives” from the Latin ones, and yet for the life of me I cannot see any more reason for deriving *Sacair* and *Sacarbhuig* from the Latin *Sacer* and *Sacrificium*, than from the Irish *Sac-fhear* (a holy or consecrated man), and *Sac-fhear-buidhe* (i.e., thank-offerings of the consecrated man); the latter, as a choice, appears to me the more probable.

Dr. Graves again repeats from his former letter that *Sagi Dari* is not good Irish, because, like *Flann file*, the *Sagi* should have followed the proper name *Daire*. My answer to this criticism is, as before, by a reference to the grammatical rule:—“When two or more substantives come together, or succeed each other, denoting the same object, they should agree by *apposition*.” It pleased Dr. Graves to overlook this; he evidently seems better pleased with the reiteration of his own inapplicable argument.

I rather superfluously supported my reference by quoting the line from Cuan O’Lochain’s poem on Tara:—

“Sai Bruceachaidh beirdis dlíciud.”

Dr. Graves’ criticism is of little consequence as affecting the rule; nevertheless, I can hardly help asking how the *victualler*, if such this name should be, could be called “*a distributor of law?*” The Jonesborough inscription I candidly abandon; I received the copy at second hand from one who had never seen the original. Dr. Graves says *he* has not only seen but also taken a rubbing of it, and his assurance is quite sufficient on that head. Lindon’s poem on Glasdromin Castle, with the double *t* orthography, cannot share the same fate, if I may credit my correspondent, who, in observing upon the Doctor’s remarks, says—“his (Dr. Graves’) copy of the poem, I venture to say, is spurious.” His reasons for so asserting I do not consider it necessary to set out, as the double *t* controversy, and, indeed I should hope, the other questions between us, are now sufficiently disposed of. At all events, I, at least, am desirous of leaving them to the “high arbitrament” of the dispassionate public who interest themselves in archæology.